arXiv:hep-th/0606104v1 12 Jun 2006

Dynamical gauge coupling unification from moduli stabilization

Kiwoon Choi*

Department of Physics
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology
Daejeon 305-701, Korea

Abstract

In D-brane models, different part of the 4-dimensional gauge group might originate from D-branes wrapping different cycles in the internal space, and then the standard model gauge couplings at the compactification scale are determined by different cycle-volume moduli. We point out that those cycle-volume moduli can naturally have universal vacuum expectation values up to small deviations suppressed by $1/8\pi^2$ if they are stabilized by KKLT-type non-perturbative superpotential. This dynamical unification of gauge couplings is independent of the detailed form of the moduli Kähler potential, but relies crucially on the existence of low energy supersymmetry. If supersymmetry is broken by an uplifting brane as in KKLT compactification, again independently of the detailed form of the moduli Kähler potential, the moduli-mediated gaugino masses at the compactification scale are universal also, and are comparable to the anomaly-mediated gaugino masses. As a result, both the gauge coupling unification at high energy scale and the mirage mediation pattern of soft supersymmetry breaking masses are achieved naturally even when the different sets of the standard model gauge bosons originate from D-branes wrapping different cycles in the internal space.

PACS numbers:

---

* kchoi@hep.kaist.ac.kr

Low energy supersymmetry (SUSY) is one of the primary candidates for physics beyond the standard model (SM) at TeV scale [1]. In addition to solving the hierarchy problem between the weak scale and the GUT/Planck scale, the minimal realization of low energy SUSY leads to a successful unification of the $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_W \times U(1)_Y$ gauge couplings at $M_{\rm GUT} \sim 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV [2]. There are several different scenarios which would ensure the gauge coupling unification at high energy scale in compactified string theory. One possibility is that $G_{\rm SM} = SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_W \times U(1)_Y$ is embedded into a simple gauge group $G_{\rm GUT}$ at a scale around or below the compactification scale. This would guarantees that the standard model couplings are unified at the scale where $G_{\rm GUT}$ is broken down to $G_{\rm SM}$. Even in the absence of such embedding, compactified string theories with low energy SUSY offer an elegant mechanism to ensure the gauge coupling unification. In many cases, the 4D gauge coupling constants are determined by a single dilaton or modulus up to small loop threshold corrections. Then the gauge kinetic functions of $G_{\rm SM}$ are given by $f_a = k_a S$ ($a = 3, 2, 1$) where k_a are *quantized* numbers which can be chosen to be integers under a proper normalization of the dilaton superfield S. In the framework of 4D effective theory, the quantization of k_a can be understood as the periodicity condition of the axion field ${\rm Im}(S)$. If the integer coefficients k_a are chosen as $k_3 = k_2 = k_1$ (Here we are using the $U(1)_Y$ hypercharge convention for which $g_1^2 = g_2^2$.), the standard model gauge couplings are unified at the compactification scale $M_{\rm com}$ as desired,

$$\frac{1}{g_a^2(M_{\rm com})} \equiv {\rm Re}(f_a) = k_a {\rm Re}(S), \tag{1}$$

and this is what happens in typical heterotic string compactifications.

Recent development in string theory suggests that our world might be described by D-brane models realized within type IIB or IIA string theory [3, 4, 5]. This set-up is particularly interesting as it provides a framework of stabilizing all moduli, leading to a landscape of string vacua which contains a phenomenologically viable nearly flat de-Sitter (dS) vacuum with low energy SUSY [4, 5]. It might be possible that the entire $G_{\rm SM}$ is obtained from a stack of $D3$-branes or Dp-branes ($p > 3$) wrapping a common ($p - 3$) cycle in the internal space. In such case, the gauge kinetic functions of $G_{\rm SM}$ are determined by a single dilaton S or modulus T with integer coefficients:

$$f_a = k_a S \quad \text{or} \quad k_a T \quad (a = 3, 2, 1), \tag{2}$$

leading to the gauge coupling unification at the string or compactification scale again under the choice $k_1 = k_2 = k_3$. However such set-up typically suffers from the difficulty of stabilizing open string moduli such as the $D3$-brane position moduli and/or the Wilson line moduli for symmetry breaking. In this regard, more interesting possibility is that the different part of $G_{\rm SM}$ originates from Dp-branes wrapping different cycles in the internal space. In such models, the gauge kinetic functions of $G_{\rm SM}$ are given by

$$f_a = k_a T_a \equiv k_a \left[\frac{e^{-\phi}}{(2\pi)^{(p-2)}(\alpha')^{(p-3)/2}} V_a + i C_a \right], \tag{3}$$

where ϕ is the string dilaton, V_a denotes the volume of the a-th $(p-3)$-cycle wrapped by the Dp-branes of the a-th gauge group, C_a is the RR axion partner of V_a, and k_a is the number of windings. In order to realize the gauge coupling unification in such case, one needs to adjust the dynamics of moduli stabilization to make the vacuum expectation values of the cycle-volumes V_a $(a = 3, 2, 1)$ to be equal up to a relative accuracy of $\mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)$, which might require non-trivial fine-tunings of the parameters governing the stabilization of V_a.

In this paper, we point out that the necessary dynamical gauge coupling unification can be naturally achieved if T_a are stabilized by KKLT-type non-perturbative superpotential [5]. Interestingly, the existence of low energy SUSY, i.e. a large hierarchy between the Planck scale and the gravitino mass, is crucial for this dynamical gauge coupling unification. It is noted also that if SUSY is broken by an uplifting brane as in the KKLT compactification of type IIB string theory [5], the SUSY-breaking F-components of T_a, more precisely $F^a/(T_a + T_a^*)$, also have universal vacuum expectation values up to small deviations suppressed by $1/8\pi^2$ independently of the moduli Kähler potential. This results in universal moduli-mediated gaugino masses at the compactification scale, which are comparable to the anomaly-mediated gaugino masses, thereby yielding the mirage mediation pattern of low energy superparticle masses which was discussed in [6, 7, 8]. Furthermore, the axionic shift symmetries for the RR-axions $\mathrm{Im}(T_a)$ assure that soft terms preserve CP [9] in this case of multi-messenger moduli also*. Also the underlying geometric set-up for matter fields suggests that it is rather plausible that moduli-mediated soft terms preserve flavors. Thus both the gauge coupling unification at high energy scale and the flavor and CP conserving mirage-mediation pattern of low energy soft terms [6, 7] are achieved naturally even when the standard model gauge bosons originate from Dp ($p > 3$) branes wrapping different $(p-3)$-cycles in the internal space.

---

* This is true for the gaugino masses and trilinear scalar couplings, while we need additional mechanism to avoid a dangerous phase of the Higgs B-parameter. However if the Higgs sector of the model is given by the next-to-minimal supersymmetric standard model (NMSSM), the axionic shift symmetries can assure that all soft terms preserve CP as was stressed in [7].

Our discussion of dynamical gauge coupling unification relies on some characteristic features of KKLT-type compactification [5]. Let us thus consider the KKLT compactification of type IIB string theory on Calabi-Yau (CY) orientifold as a concrete example. Following [4], we consider a set-up in which the string dilaton and all complex structure moduli are stabilized by RR and NS-NS 3-form fluxes with heavy masses. We then assume that all visible sector gauge groups originate from $D7$ branes wrapping the 4-cycles Σ_a of CY orientifold. The visible sector gauge kinetic functions in such set-up are given by (3) with $p = 7$, where now T_a denote the Kähler moduli of CY orientifold and C_a are the RR 4-form axions. Following KKLT [5], let us assume that T_a are stabilized by non-perturbative effects such as $D3$-brane instantons wrapping Σ_a or hidden gaugino condensations on $D7$ branes wrapping Σ_a. After the string dilaton and complex structure moduli are integrated out, these non-perturbative effects yield the following form of the effective superpotential:

$$W_{\rm eff} = w_0 + \sum_a A_a e^{-8\pi^2 r_a T_a} \tag{4}$$

where w_0 and A_a are effective parameters depending on the vacuum expectation values of heavy complex structure moduli, while r_a are (either topological or group theoretical) *rational* numbers. Without loss of generality, one can always make ω_0 and A_a real by an appropriate $U(1)_R$ transformation and also the axionic shift transformations:

$$T_a \to T_a + \text{imaginary constant}. \tag{5}$$

In the following, we will use such field basis in which ω_0 and A_a are real parameters. Note that yet this does not mean that the vacuum expectation value of $W_{\rm eff}$ is real.

For $D3$-brane instantons and $D7$-brane gaugino condensations, the corresponding coefficients A_a are generically of order unity. On the other hand, ω_0 is required to be small to get low energy SUSY since it determines the gravitino mass as $\omega_0 \sim m_{3/2}$ in the unit with the 4D Planck scale $M_{Pl} = 1$. For instance, one needs $\omega_0 \sim 10^{-14}$ to get $m_{3/2} \sim 10$ TeV which would be necessary for low energy SUSY in our case. Such hierarchically small value of ω_0 might be able to be obtained for a particular set of RR and NS-NS flux configurations in the landscape of type IIB flux vacua [10]. Alternatively, there might be an R-symmetry which is preserved by fluxes, but is broken only by non-perturbative effects. In such case, hierarchically small ω_0 can be generated naturally by gaugino condensation on $D3$ brane, yielding $\omega_0 \sim e^{-8\pi^2 S/N}$ which becomes an exponentially small constant after the type IIB dilaton S is integrated out. Here we simply assume that w_0 has a correct value for low energy SUSY, e.g. $w_0 \sim m_{3/2} \sim 10^{-14}$ in the unit with $M_{Pl} = 1$, without specifying its origin. In fact, this large hierarchy between $m_{3/2}$ and M_{Pl} is a key element of the dynamical gauge coupling unification which will be discussed below.

As for the quantized coefficients r_a, if the non-perturbative superpotential of T_a is due to $D3$ brane instanton, one finds $r_a = 1$ [11]. Another possible origin of the non-perturbative superpotential is hidden gaugino condensation [12]. Suppose that $D7$ branes wrapping Σ_a provides a supersymmetric hidden $SU(N_a)$ gauge theory with the gauge kinetic function $f_H = k_a^{(H)} T_a$ in addition to the a-th visible sector gauge group with the gauge kinetic function $f_a = k_a T_a$, where again we choose the normalization of T_a for which k_a and $k_a^{(H)}$ are integers[†]. Then the gaugino condensation of $SU(N_a)$ gives $r_a = k_a^{(H)}/N_a$. In fact, string theoretic determination of k_a and r_a is not our major concern here as our subsequent discussion will rely *only* on that both k_a and r_a are (topological or group theoretical) *rational* numbers, which can be ensured by the periodicity of the axion field $\mathrm{Im}(T_a)$ within the framework of 4D effective theory.

Let us examine the 4D gauge couplings in the model with the visible sector gauge kinetic function (3) and the moduli superpotential (4). As is well known, the moduli superpotential (4) stabilizes T_a at the supersymmetric AdS vacuum [5] satisfying

$$D_a W_{\text{eff}} = \partial_a W_{\text{eff}} + \partial_a K_0 W_{\text{eff}} = 0, \tag{6}$$

where K_0 denotes the moduli Kähler potential. The resulting vacuum expectation values of $\mathrm{Re}(T_a)$ are given by

$$r_a \langle \mathrm{Re}(T_a) \rangle = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \left(\frac{8\pi^2 M_{Pl}}{|m_{3/2}|} \right) + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \left(\frac{e^{K_0/2} r_a A_a}{|\partial_a K|} \right), \tag{7}$$

where $m_{3/2} = e^{K_0/2} W_{\text{eff}}$. As $A_a, r_a, \partial_a K_0$ and $e^{K_0/2}$ are generically of order unity, while $M_{Pl}/m_{3/2} \sim 10^{14}$ for $m_{3/2} \sim 10$ TeV, the above result shows that even when A_a, r_a and $\partial_a K$

[†] In 4D effective theory, one might redefine T_a in a way for which either $k_a = 1$ or $r_a = 1$. Here we use the definition of T_a given in (3), for which k_a are integers and r_a are rational numbers.

are *not* universal, $r_a\mathrm{Re}(T_a)$ have universal vacuum expectation values ($\sim 1/2$) up to small deviations suppressed by $1/8\pi^2$. The resulting 4D gauge couplings at the compactification scale $M_{\rm com}$ are given by

$$\frac{1}{g_a^2(M_{\rm com})}=\frac{k_a}{2r_a}\left[\frac{\ln(8\pi^2M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)}{4\pi^2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right]=\frac{k_a}{2r_a}\left[1+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right], \tag{8}$$

where we have used $\ln(8\pi^2M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)\simeq 4\pi^2$ for the gravitino mass $m_{3/2}\sim 10$ TeV. Thus if one chooses the (topological or group theoretical) rational numbers k_a and r_a as

$$k_a/r_a=4, \tag{9}$$

one achieves the successful gauge coupling unification at $M_{\rm com}$ with the correct unified coupling constant $g^2_{GUT}\simeq 2$ even though different set of gauge bosons originate from $D7$ branes wrapping different 4-cycles. Note that the scheme is totally independent of the form of the moduli Kähler potential, while the existence of large hierarchy $M_{Pl}/m_{3/2}\sim 10^{14}$ which is necessary for low energy SUSY is crucial for this dynamical gauge coupling unification.

The universal vacuum values of $r_a\mathrm{Re}(T_a)$ in (7) correspond to a supersymmetric AdS vacuum. To obtain phenomenologically viable dS (or Minkowski) vacuum, one needs to introduce a SUSY-breaking brane into the above moduli stabilization set-up, providing an additional moduli potential lifting the AdS vacuum of (7) to a dS vacuum [5]. Then one should make sure that the universality of the moduli vacuum values is not spoiled by the vacuum shift induced by the uplifting potential. As we will see, the vacuum shifts due to the uplifting potential are small enough not to destabilize the dynamical gauge coupling unification set by $W_{\rm eff}$:

$$\delta\mathrm{Re}(T_a)=\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m_{3/2}^2}{m_{T_a}^2}\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{(8\pi^2)^2}\right). \tag{10}$$

Let us now discuss the SUSY-breaking induced by an uplifting brane in the above scenario of dynamical gauge coupling unification. The uplifting brane might be an anti-$D3$ brane as in the original KKLT proposal [5] or a different kind of brane on which SUSY is spontaneoulsy broken [13, 14]. In fact, our whole discussion is independent of the detailed property of the uplifting brane because of the following reason. One of the generic features of IIB flux compactification on CY orientifold is the presence of warped throat. In the presence of such warped throat, the SUSY-breaking brane will be stabilized at the end of (maximally) warped throat in order to minimize its contribution to the 4D effective potential [5]. As was discussed in [6], low energy consequences of such *red-shifted* SUSY-breaking brane can be described by a *single* D-type spurion operator whose coefficient is uniquely fixed by the condition of nearly vanishing 4D cosmological constant. More explicitly, independently of the detailed property of the red-shifted uplifting brane, low energy physics of the visible fields and light moduli can be described by the following form of 4D effective action:

$$\int d^4\theta \left[-3CC^* e^{-K/3} - e^{4A} C^2 C^{*2} \mathcal{P}_{\rm lift} \theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2\right] + \left(\int d^2\theta \left[\frac{1}{4} f_a W^{a\alpha} W^a_\alpha + C^3 W\right] + {\rm h.c.}\right), \quad (11)$$

where $C = C_0 + F^C \theta^2$ is the chiral compensator superfield, e^A is the energy red-shift factor on the world-volume of SUSY-breaking brane [15], K and W are the conventional Kähler potential and superpotential which can be expanded in powers of the visible matter superfields Q^i:

$$\begin{aligned} K &= K_0(T_a, T_a^*) + Z_i(T_a, T_a^*) Q^{i*} Q^i, \\ W &= W_{\rm eff}(T_a) + \frac{1}{6} \lambda_{ijk}(T_a) Q^i Q^j Q^k. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the Einstein frame, the moduli potential from the superspace lagrangian density (11) takes the form:

$$V_{\rm TOT} = e^{K_0} \left[K^{a\bar{b}} D_a W_{\rm eff} (D_b W_{\rm eff})^* - 3|W_{\rm eff}|^2\right] + V_{\rm lift}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$V_{\rm lift} = e^{4A} e^{2K_0/3} \mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}. \quad (14)$$

The superspace lagrangian density (11) also determines the auxiliary components of C and T_a as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F^C}{C_0} &= m_{3/2}^* + \frac{1}{3} F^a \partial_a K, \\ F^a &= -e^{K_0/2} K^{a\bar{b}} (D_b W_{\rm eff})^*. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

To analyze SUSY-breaking, one needs first to compute the vacuum expectation values of F^a determined by $V_{\rm TOT}$. To this end, let us expand $V_{\rm TOT}$ and F^a around the supersymmetric configuration satisfying (6). We then find

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\rm TOT} &= -3|m_{3/2}(\vec{T}_0)|^2 + V_{\rm lift}(\vec{T}_0) + \partial_a V_{\rm lift}(\vec{T}_0)\delta T_a + \partial_{\bar{a}} V_{\rm lift}(\vec{T}_0)\delta T_a^* \\ &\quad + m^2_{a\bar{b}}(\vec{T}_0)\delta T_a \delta T_b^* + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mu^2_{ab}(\vec{T}_0)\delta T_a \delta T_b + {\rm h.c.}\right) + \mathcal{O}((\delta T)^3), \\ F^a &= -K^{a\bar{b}} v^*_{\bar{b}\bar{c}} \delta T_c^* - m_{3/2}^* \delta T_a + \mathcal{O}((\delta T)^2), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $T_a = T_{0a} + \delta T_a$ for the supersymmetric moduli configuration T_{0a} satisfying (6), and

$$\begin{aligned} m^2_{a\bar{b}} &= K^{c\bar{d}} v_{ac} v^*_{\bar{b}\bar{d}} - 2|m_{3/2}|^2 \partial_a \partial_{\bar{b}} K_0, \\ \mu^2_{ab} &= -m^*_{3/2} v_{ab}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for

$$v_{ab} = e^{K_0/2} \left[\partial_a \partial_b W_{\text{eff}} + (\partial_a \partial_b K_0 - \partial_a K_0 \partial_b K_0) W_{\text{eff}} \right]. \tag{18}$$

For the superpotential (4), we have

$$\partial_a \partial_b W_{\text{eff}} \;=\; -8\pi^2 r_a \partial_a W_{\text{eff}} \delta_{ab} = 8\pi^2 r_a \partial_a K_0 W_{\text{eff}} \delta_{ab}, \tag{19}$$

where we have used the SUSY condition (6) for the last expression.

Since $r_a \text{Re}(T_a) \simeq 1/2$ as derived in (7), generically $\partial_a \partial_b K_0 \sim \partial_a K_0 \partial_b K_0 \sim r_a \partial_a K_0$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} v_{ab} &= 8\pi^2 r_a \partial_a K_0 m_{3/2} \delta_{ab} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}(8\pi^2 m_{3/2}), \\ m^2_{a\bar{b}} &= (8\pi^2)^2 K^{a\bar{b}} r_a r_b \partial_a K_0 \partial_{\bar{b}} K_0 |m_{3/2}|^2 \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}((8\pi^2 m_{3/2})^2), \\ F^a &= -8\pi^2 K^{a\bar{b}} r_b \partial_{\bar{b}} K_0 m^*_{3/2} \delta T^*_b \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}(8\pi^2 m_{3/2} \delta T_a). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Then the equation of motion $\partial_a V_{\text{TOT}} = 0$ leads to

$$(8\pi^2)^2 |m_{3/2}|^2 \sum_b K^{a\bar{b}} r_a r_b \partial_{\bar{b}} K_0 \delta T^*_b = -\frac{\partial_a V_{\text{lift}}}{\partial_a K_0} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right). \tag{21}$$

Combining this with the condition of vanishing cosmological constant, we find

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{lift}}(\vec{T}_0) &= 3|m_{3/2}(\vec{T}_0)|^2 \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{(8\pi^2)^2})\right), \\ \sum_b K^{a\bar{b}} r_a r_b \partial_{\bar{b}} K_0 \delta T^*_b &= -\frac{3}{(8\pi^2)^2} \frac{\partial_a \ln(V_{\text{lift}})}{\partial_a K_0} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

which shows that indeed

$$\delta T_a = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{(8\pi^2)^2}\right) \tag{23}$$

as anticipated in (10). Applying (22) to F^a in (20), we finally find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F^a}{T_a + T^*_a} &= \frac{m^*_{3/2}}{8\pi^2} \frac{1}{r_a(T_a + T^*_a)} \frac{3\partial_a \ln(V_{\text{lift}})}{\partial_a K} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{m^*_{3/2}}{\ln(M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)} \frac{3\partial_a \ln(V_{\text{lift}})}{2\partial_a K} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where we have used the moduli vacuum values (7) for the last expression.

The above result shows that $F^a/(T_a+T_a^*)$ are universal if $\partial_a \ln(V_{\rm lift})/\partial_a K$ are universal. In fact, $\partial_a \ln(V_{\rm lift})/\partial_a K_0$ are universal independently of the form of K_0 in the most interesting case that SUSY-breaking brane is stabilized at the end of warped throat [5]. In this case, T_a are sequestered from the SUSY-breaking brane, which means that $\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}$ is independent of T_a [6, 16]. One then has $V_{\rm lift} = De^{2K_0/3}$ for a constant D of $\mathcal{O}(m_{3/2}^2 M_{Pl}^2)$, yielding

$$\frac{F^a}{T_a+T_a^*} = \frac{m_{3/2}^*}{\ln(M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)}\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right). \tag{25}$$

One might consider a more general possibility that the uplifting function $\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}$ depends on T_a, but only through K_0, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift} = \mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}[K_0(T_a, T_a^*)]. \tag{26}$$

In this more general case, $\partial_a \ln(V_{\rm lift})/\partial_a K_0$ are still universal, yielding

$$\frac{F^a}{T_a+T_a^*} = \frac{m_{3/2}^*}{\ln(M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)}\left(1+\frac{3}{2}\frac{d\ln(\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift})}{dK_0}\right)\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right). \tag{27}$$

Note that both the magnitudes and phases of $F^a/(T_a+T_a^*)$ are universal independently of the form of K_0 and also of the values of the quantized numbers k_a and r_a. This universality is valid even when the condition (9) for the gauge coupling unification is not satisfied. What is required is only the condition (26) which is satisfied for the case that SUSY-breaking brane is stabilized at the end of a warped throat.

So far, we have shown that $r_a\text{Re}(T_a)$ and $F^a/(T_a+T_a^*)$ have universal vacuum expectation values up to small deviations suppressed by $1/8\pi^2$. With universal $r_a\langle\text{Re}(T_a)\rangle$, we can realize a dynamical unification of gauge couplings even when the standard model gauge bosons originate from D branes wrapping different cycles in the internal space. Let us now consider possible implications of the universality of $F^a/(T_a+T_a^*)$ for soft SUSY-breaking terms of visible fields, in particular for the SUSY CP and flavor problems. Since we have relatively many (equally important) sources of SUSY-breaking, i.e. F^a $(a=1,2,3,...)$ and F^C, one might worry that the resulting soft terms can cause dangerous SUSY CP and/or flavor violation. However it turns out that the set-up can preserve CP and flavor in a rather natural way.

The soft SUSY-breaking terms of canonically normalized visible fields can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm soft} \;=\; -\frac{1}{2}M_a\lambda^a\lambda^a - \frac{1}{2}m_i^2|\tilde{Q}^i|^2 - \frac{1}{6}A_{ijk}y_{ijk}\tilde{Q}^i\tilde{Q}^j\tilde{Q}^k + \text{h.c.}, \tag{28}$$

where λ^a are gauginos, $\tilde{Q}^i$ is the scalar component of the matter superfield Q^i, and y_{ijk} are the canonically normalized Yukawa couplings: $y_{ijk} = \lambda_{ijk}/\sqrt{e^{-K_0}Z_iZ_jZ_k}$. The most interesting feature of the SUSY-breaking by red-shifted uplifting brane is that the induced F-components of T_a are of $\mathcal{O}(m_{3/2}/8\pi^2)$ as can be seen in (24). As a result, the tree-level moduli-mediated soft masses of $\mathcal{O}(F^a/T_a)$ are comparable to the 1-loop anomaly-mediated soft masses of $\mathcal{O}(m_{3/2}/8\pi^2)$ [17], leading to the mirage mediation pattern of superparticle masses at low energy scale [6, 7, 8]. Note that the 1-loop anomaly-mediation does not depend on the UV physics above the compactification scale as it is determined by the infrared structure of 4D effective theory. On the other hand, 1-loop threshold corrections to the moduli mediation at the compactification scale are generically sensitive to the physics above the compactification scale. Such UV-sensitive corrections to the soft masses are of $\mathcal{O}(F^a/8\pi^2T_a)$, thus can be safely ignored in our computation of soft terms at the compactification scale. Then from the superspace action (11), one finds that the soft masses renormalized at $M_{\rm com}$ are given by[‡]

$$\begin{aligned}
M_a(M_{\rm com}) &= \sum_b F^b\partial_b \ln\left(\text{Re}(f_a)\right) + \frac{b_a g_a^2}{8\pi^2}\frac{F^C}{C_0}, \\
A_{ijk}(M_{\rm com}) &= -\sum_b F^b\partial_b \ln\left(\frac{\lambda_{ijk}}{e^{-K_0}Z_iZ_jZ_k}\right) - \frac{1}{16\pi^2}(\gamma_i+\gamma_j+\gamma_k)\frac{F^C}{C_0}, \\
m_i^2(M_{\rm com}) &= \frac{2}{3}V_{\rm TOT} - \sum_{b,c} F^bF^{c*}\partial_b\partial_{\bar{c}}\ln\left(e^{-K_0/3}Z_i\right) \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{32\pi^2}\frac{d\gamma_i}{d\ln\mu}\left|\frac{F^C}{C_0}\right|^2 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\left(\sum_b \partial_b\gamma_i F^b\left(\frac{F^C}{C_0}\right)^* + \text{h.c.}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where b_a and γ_i are the one-loop beta function coefficients and the anomalous dimension of Q^i, respectively, defined as $dg_a/d\ln\mu = b_a g_a^3/8\pi^2$ and $d\ln Z_i/d\ln\mu = \gamma_i/8\pi^2$.

For f_a given by (3), the gaugino masses are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
M_a(M_{\rm com}) &= \frac{F^a}{(T_a+T_a^*)} + \frac{b_a}{8\pi^2}g_a^2 m_{3/2}^* \\
&= \left(1+\alpha\,\frac{\ln(M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)}{8\pi^2}b_a g_a^2(M_{\rm com})\right)M_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where M_0 denotes the *universal* moduli-mediated gaugino mass at $M_{\rm com}$, i.e.

$$M_0 \equiv \frac{F^a}{T_a+T_a^*}, \tag{31}$$

[‡] There might be model-dependent extra contribution to m_i^2 mediated by a light vector multiplet in the warped throat [14, 18], however it does not affect our discussion in this paper.

and α represents the moduli-mediation to anomaly-mediation ratio[§]:

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{m^*_{3/2}}{M_0 \ln(M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)} = 1 + \frac{3}{2}\frac{d\ln(\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift})}{dK_0}. \tag{32}$$

A notable features of the above gaugino masses is that the moduli-mediated gaugino masses at $M_{\rm com}$ are universal (both the magnitudes and phases) independently of the form of K_0, and also independently of the discrete numbers k_a and r_a, thus independently of whether the gauge coupling unification condition (9) is satisfied. Another interesting feature is that the universal moduli-mediated gaugino mass M_0 has the same phase as the anomaly-mediated gaugino masses, thus there is no CP-violating relative phase between different gaugino masses, again independently of the form of K_0 and the values of k_a and r_a. The subsequent renormalization group evolution of (30) leads to the mirage mediation pattern of low energy gaugino masses:

$$M_a(\mu) = M_0\left[1 - \frac{1}{4\pi^2}b_a g_a^2(\mu)\ln\left(\frac{M_{\rm com}}{(M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)^{\alpha/2}\mu}\right)\right], \tag{33}$$

with the mirage messenger scale $M_{\rm mirage} = M_{\rm com}/(M_{Pl}/|m_{3/2}|)^{\alpha/2}$. Thus even when the standard model gauge bosons originate from $D7$-branes wrapping different 4-cycles in CY orientifold, a CP-conserving mirage mediation pattern of low energy gaugino masses is obtained *independently of* the form of the moduli Kähler potential and also of the discrete parameters k_a and r_a which determine the gauge kinetic functions and the non-perturbative superpotential.

In fact, the (approximate) CP-invariance of the full soft terms can be ensured by adopting a string theoretic property of the RR axions $\mathrm{Im}(T_a)$, i.e. the property that the axionic shift symmetry under the transformation (5) is broken only by non-perturbative effects [9]. For the moduli vacuum values (7), those non-perturbative corrections to the moduli Kähler potential K_0, the matter Kähler metric Z_i and the holomorphic Yukawa couplings λ_{ijk} are negligible compared to the leading order terms, thus K_0, Z_i and λ_{ijk} are all invariant under

$$T_a \to T_a + \text{imaginary constant}.$$

[§] Clearly $\alpha = 1$ is the most plausible value of the moduli-mediation to anomaly-mediation ratio as it is predicted by the simplest class of models with a sequestered uplifting brane for which $\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}$ is independent of T_a. Still it is possible to get a different value of α while keeping $\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}$ independent of T_a by generalizing for instance the gauge kinetic functions as $f_a = k_a T_a + \text{constant}$, while keeping $W_{\rm eff}$ unchanged [18, 19]

This means that K_0 and Z_i depend only on the combinations $T_a + T_a^*$, and λ_{ijk} are T_a-independent constants:

$$\begin{aligned} K_0 &= K_0(T_a + T_a^*), \\ Z_i &= Z_i(T_a + T_a^*), \\ \lambda_{ijk} &= \text{constants}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

It is rather obvious that for the above forms of K_0, Z_i and λ_{ijk}, the soft parameters of (29) preserve CP. Note that F^a and $F^C/C_0 = m_{3/2}^* + F^a\partial_a K_0/3$ have a common phase as is shown in (27), and this common phase can be rotated away by an appropriate field redefinition. As for the flavor issue, a crucial point might be that matter superfields with the same gauge quantum numbers originate from the intersection of the same pair of 4-cycles. It is then expected that the Kähler metrics of the matter fields with same gauge quantum numbers have a common dependence on the 4-cycle volume moduli T_a[¶], which would ensure that the soft terms of (29) mediated by T_a and C preserve flavor also.

To conclude, we pointed out that the gauge coupling unification at high energy scales can be naturally achieved even when the different sets of the standard model gauge bosons originate from Dp-branes wrapping different $(p-3)$-cycles in the internal space, if the gauge coupling moduli are stabilized by KKLT-type superpotential. This dynamical gauge coupling unification is independent of the form of the moduli Kähler potential, but relies crucially on the existence of low energy SUSY with which $\ln(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2}) \sim 4\pi^2$. We also examined the SUSY-breaking due to an uplifting brane in the scenario of dynamical gauge coupling unification. If the uplifting brane is stabilized at the end of warped throat as in the KKLT compactification of type IIB string theory, the resulting moduli-mediated gaugino masses at the compactification scale are universal independently of the form of the moduli Kähler potential and also independently of the discrete parameters which determine the gauge kinetic functions and the nonperturbative superpotential. The universal moduli-mediated gaugino mass is comparable to the anomaly-mediated gaugino masses, thereby yielding the mirage mediation pattern of low energy superparticle masses as was discussed before [6, 7, 8]. There are relatively many (equally important) sources of SUSY-breaking, i.e. the auxiliary components of the gauge coupling moduli T_a ($a = 1, 2, 3, ...$) and the chiral compensator superfield C, thus one might worry about dangerous SUSY CP and/or flavor violations. It turns out that soft terms naturally preserve CP as a consequence of the axionic shift symmetries for the RR axion components of the gauge coupling moduli. As for the SUSY flavor conservation, since the matter superfields with same gauge quantum number originate from the intersection of same pair of cycles, it is expected that their Kḧler metric has a flavor-universal dependence on the cycle volume moduli T_a, leading to flavor-conserving soft terms. Thus both the gauge coupling unification at high energy scale and the flavor and CP conserving mirage mediation pattern of low energy soft terms can be naturally obtained even when the standard model gauge bosons originate from D-branes wrapping different cycles in the internal space.

[¶] The matter Kähler metric Z_i and the holomorphic Yukawa couplings λ_{ijk} generically have a flavor non-universal dependence on the complex structure moduli, which might be responsible for the hierarchical structure of the canonical Yukawa couplings $y_{ijk} = \lambda_{ijk}/\sqrt{e^{-K_0}Z_iZ_jZ_k}$. In our set-up, the complex structure moduli Z^α are assumed to get heavy masses $m_{Z^\alpha} \gg 8\pi^2 m_{3/2}$ from fluxes, thus their contributions to soft masses are negligible as $F^{Z^\alpha} \sim m_{3/2}^2/m_{Z^\alpha} \ll m_{3/2}/8\pi^2$.

Acknowledgments

I thank K. S. Choi, M. Cvetic, A. Hebecker, T. Kobayashi, H. P. Nilles and A. Uranga for helpful discussions. I also thank the Galileo Galilei Institute for Theoretical Physics for the hospitality and the INFN for partial support during the completion of this work. This work is supported by the KRF Grant funded by the Korean Government (KRF-2005-201-C00006), the KOSEF Grant (KOSEF R01-2005-000-10404-0), and the Center for High Energy Physics of Kyungpook National University.

[1] H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. **110**, 1 (1984); H. E. Haber and G. L. Kane, Phys. Rept. **117**, 75 (1985).

[2] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim and U. W. Lee, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **6**, 1745 (1991); U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Furstenau, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 447 (1991); J. R. Ellis, S. Kelley and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 131 (1991); P. Langacker and M. x. Luo, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 817 (1991).

[3] See for instance R. Blumenhagen, M. Cvetic, P. Langacker, G. Shiu, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **55**, 71 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0502005].

[4] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 106006 (2002) [arXiv: hep-th/0105097].

[5] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 046005 (2003) [arXiv: hep-th/0301240].

[6] K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles, M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, JHEP **0411**, 076 (2004) [arXiv: hep-th/0411066]; K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles and M. Olechowski, Nucl. Phys. **B718**, 113 (2005) [arXiv: hep-th/0503216].

[7] K. Choi, K. S. Jeong and K. Okumura, JHEP **0509**, 039 (2005) [arXiv: hep-ph/0504037].

[8] M. Endo, M. Yamaguchi and K. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 015004 (2005) [arXiv: hep-ph/0504036]; A. Falkowski, O. Lebedev and Y. Mambrini, JHEP **0511**, 034 (2005) [arXiv: hep-ph/0507110]; K. Choi, K. S. Jeong, T. Kobayashi and K.-I. Okumura, Phys. Lett. **B633**, 355 (2006) [arXiv: hep-ph/0508029]; R. Kitano and Y. Nomura, Phys. Lett. **B631**, 58 (2005) [arXiv: hep-ph/0509039]; O. Lebedev, H. P. Nilles and M. Ratz, hep-ph/0511320; R. Kitano and Y. Nomura, hep-ph/0602096; A. Pierce and J. Thaler, hep-ph/0604192; H. Baer, E.-K. Park, X. Tata and T. T. Wang, hep-ph/0604253.

[9] K. Choi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1592 (1994) [arXiv: hep-ph/9311352]

[10] F. Denef and M. R. Douglas, JHEP **0405**, 072 (2004) [arXiv: hep-th/0404116]; M. Dine, D. O'Neil, Z. Sun, JHEP **0507**, 014 (2005) [arXiv: hep-th/0501214].

[11] J. Polchinski, String theory, Cambridge Univ. Pr. (1998).

[12] For a recent review, see H. P. Nilles, hep-th/0402022.

[13] O. Lebedev, H. P. Nilles, M. Ratz, Phys. Lett. **B636**, 126 (2006) [arXiv: hep-th/0603047]

[14] F. Brummer, A. Hebecker, M. Trapletti, hep-th/0605232.

[15] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999) [arXiv: hep-ph/9905221].

[16] F. Brummer, A. Hebecker and E. Trincherini, Nucl. Phys. **B738**, 283 (2006) [arXiv: hep-th/0510113].

[17] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Nucl. Phys. B **557**, 79 (1999) [arXiv: hep-th/9810155]; G. F. Giudice, M. A. Luty, H. Murayama and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **9812**, 027 (1998) [arXiv: hep-ph/9810442]; J. A. Bagger, T. Moroi and E. Poppitz, JHEP **0004**, 009 (2000) [arXiv: hep-th/9911029]; P. Binetruy, M. K. Gaillard and B. D. Nelson, Nucl. Phys. B **604**, 32 (2001) [arXiv: hep-ph/0011081].

[18] K. Choi and K. S. Jeong, hep-th/0605108.

[19] H. Abe, T. Higaki and T. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 046005 (2006) [arXiv: hep-th/0511160].